arXiv:1605.05824v1 [math.GM] 19 May 2016

On a Certain Function with Negative Coefficients

Dov Aharonov

Abstract

In what follows we improve an inequality related to matrix theory.
T. Laffey proved (2013) a weaker form of this inequality [2].

Theorem 1 *Given* $\rho = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mu_k \leq 1$, $\mu_k > 0$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n$,
$c_1 > c_2 > \cdots > c_n > 0$
Then for $n \geq 2$, *or* $n = 1$ $\mu_1 < 1$*:*

$$(1) \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \pi(1 - c_j t)^{\mu_j} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j t^j \text{ we have } D_j > 0 \ , \ j = 1, 2, \ldots$$

Lemma 1 *In order to prove the theorem it is enough to prove it for* $\rho = 1$.

Proof of Lemma 1

Assume that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j = 1$ and that for this case the theorem is proved.
Then for $0 < \rho < 1$ we have

$$(1-\sum D_j t^j)^{\rho} = 1-\rho \sum D_j t^j + \rho(\rho-1) \left(\sum D_j t^j \right)^2 - \frac{1}{6}\rho(\rho-1)(\rho-2) \left(\sum D_j t^j \right)^3 + \cdots$$

$$= 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tilde{D}_j t^j$$

Hence $\tilde{D}_j > 0$

■

From now on we may assume, without loss of generality,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j = 1 \tag{2}$$

Lemma 2 *Assuming* (1) *and* (2) *we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \mu_j = D_1 \ , \ D_1 > c_n \tag{3}$$

Proof of Lemma 2

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n}(1-c_j t)^{\mu_j} = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(1-\mu_j c_j t+O(t^2)) = 1-\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mu_j c_j\right)t+O(t^2) = 1-D_1 t+O(t^2)$$

Hence, the first part is confirmed.

For the second part recall the monotonicity of c_j.

We have

$$D_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \mu_j > c_n \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j = c_n$$

■

The proof of our theorem will be by induction. For $n = 1, 2$ the proof follows very simply. Details are omitted.

Now assume that the theorem is proved for $n-1$ ($n \geq 3$). We want to prove it for n. Suppose that this is not the case.

It will be convenient to use the notation

$$L_k = \prod_{j=1}^{k}(1 - c_j t)^{\mu_j} \tag{4}$$

Obviously, $L_k = L_{k-1}(1 - c_k t)^{\mu_k}$. In particular,

$$L_n = L_{n-1}(1 - c_n t)^{\mu_n} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j t^j$$

By our assumption, there exists among the coefficients at least one which is not negative. Take the smallest index, say m, for which this is true. Hence

$$-D_j < 0\ ,\ 1 \le j \le m-1\ ,\ -D_m \ge 0 \tag{5}$$

Time has come to use a simple idea, but useful.

From (4)

$$L_n = L_{n-2}(1-c_{n-1}t)^{\mu_{n-1}}(1-c_nt)^{\mu_n}$$

Then for $c_n = 0$ $L_n = L_{n-1}$ and we are back to the case of $n-1$ factors, i.e. the theorem is assumed to be correct by the induction assumption. The same follows if we assume $c_{n-1} = c_n$.

Indeed $(1-c_{n-1}t)^{\mu_{n-1}}(1-c_nt)^{\mu_n} = (1-c_{n-1}t)^{\mu_{n-1}+\mu_n}$, and again we have $n-1$ factors. (Note that if we want to prove a weaker result for $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \cdots = \mu_n = \frac{1}{n}$ the proof does not work!!)

Figure 1



By the induction assumption.

$j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$

Figure 2



$-D_m(0) < 0$
$-D_m(c_{n-1}) < 0$

Consider now c_n as a variable and $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{n-1}$ as fixed.

$$0 \le c_n \le c_{n-1}$$

Since $-D_m \geq 0$ at some point, say $\bar{c}_n$, for this interval and also $-D_m(0) < 0$, $-D_m(c_{n-1}) < 0$ it follows by the mean value theorem that for some point in this interval, say c_n^*: $-D_m(c_n^*) = 0$.

But there are only finite number of zeros of $-D_m$. This is true due to the fact that it is a polynomial function of the variable c_n. Thus, without loss of generality, c_n^* may be taken as the largest zero in the interval $(0, c_{n-1})$.

Figure 3



Figure 4



Thus (due to the fact that there are finite number of zeros as explained above) we have that the interval (c_n^*, c_{n-1}) is free of zeros.

In what follows we show a contradiction. this will be done by considering a sufficiently small interval $(c_n^*, c_n^* + \varepsilon)$ for which $-D_m$ is changed from zero at c_n^* to a positive value.

We now present the calculations leading to this assertion.

Indeed

$$L_n(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{n-1}, c_n^* + \varepsilon) = L_{n-1}(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{n-1})(1 - (c_n^* + \varepsilon)t)^{\mu_n} =$$

$$= L_{n-1}(1 - c_n^* t - \varepsilon t)^{\mu_n}$$

Also:

$$(1-c_n^* t-\varepsilon t)^{\mu_n} = (1-c_n^* t)^{\mu_n} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon t}{1 - c_n^* t}\right)^{\mu_n} = (1-c_n^* t)^{\mu_n} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon t}{1 - c_n^* t}\mu_n + O(\varepsilon^2)\right)$$

Thus

$$L_n(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{n-1}, c_n^*+\varepsilon) = [L_{n-1}(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{n-1})(1-c_n^* t)^{\mu_n}] \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon t}{1 - c_n^* t}\mu_n + O(\varepsilon^2)\right)$$

$$= (1-D_1 t-D_2 t^2-\cdots-D_{m-1}t^{m-1}+0-D_{m+1}t^{m+1}+\cdots) \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon t \mu_n}{1 - c_n^* t} + O(\varepsilon^2)\right) = R \,(\text{notation})$$

To continue it will be convenient to use the notation $\{F\}_K$ for the k-th coefficient of F.

Also denote $\mu_n \varepsilon$ by ε^*.

$$\{R\}_m = \left\{ \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} D_j t^j\right) \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon^* t}{1 - c_n^* t}\right) \right\}_m + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

Positive terms do not destroy positivity if ignored, hence

$$\{R\}_m = \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^* t}{1 - c_n^* t} \right\}_m + \left\{ (D_1 t) \left(\frac{\varepsilon^* t}{1 - c_n^* t}\right) \right\}_m + \text{ positive terms } + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\{R\}_m &\geq -\varepsilon (c_n^*)^{m-1} + (\varepsilon^*) \left\{ D_1 t^2 \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (c_n^* t)^k\right) \right\}_m + O(\varepsilon^2) \\
\{R\}_m &\geq -\varepsilon (c_n^*)^{m-1} + \varepsilon^* D_1 (c_n^*)^{m-2} + O(\varepsilon^*) \\
\{R\}_m &\geq \varepsilon^* (c_n^*)^{m-2} [-c_n^* + D_1] + O(\varepsilon^*)
\end{aligned}$$

For ε small enough this is positive by (3) applied for the special value c_n^* of c_n.

Hence, positivity of the n-th coefficient is established provided ε is small enough. Thus we arrived at a contradiction, which ends the proof. ■

Figure 5



Contradiction
Compare with Figure 4

Acknowledgment
I want to thank Prof Raphi Loewy for bringing to my attention the papers [1] and [2].

References

[1] F. Holland: *A contribution to the inverse eigenvalue problem for non- negative matrices*, Mathematical Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy 110A (2013) 13-19;
doi:10.3318/PRIA.2010.110.1.13.

[2] T. J. Laffey: *Formal power series and the spectra of nonnegative real matrices*, Mathematical Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy 113A (2013) (2), 97-106;
doi:10.3318/PRIA.2013.113.10.

Department of mathematics-I.I.T,Haifa 32000.Israel.
E-mail address: dova@tx.technion.ac.il